

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTONIO ZAVALA,

Plaintiff,

v.

SALVADOR REIGOSA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:21-cv-01631 JLT SKO

ORDER RE MAY 25, 2022 FILING

(Doc. 13)

On April 5, 2022, this case was dismissed for failure to state a claim, (Doc. 11), and the Court entered judgment the same day (Doc. 12). On May 25, 2022, Plaintiff filed a document using a complaint form designed to facilitate the submission of complaints of judicial misconduct to the Clerk of Court for the Court of Federal Claims in Washington, DC. (Doc. 13.) Plaintiff edited the title of that form to read “motion for judicial misconduct by an employee.” (*Id.*) Therein, Plaintiff raises certain substantive objections to the dismissal of his case and suggests that Court staff may have had a “conflict of interest.” (*Id.* at 3–4.)

To the extent Plaintiff is requesting reconsideration of the underlying determination that his complaint fails to state a claim, his filing fails to articulate any basis for reconsideration. The thrust of the magistrate judge’s reasoning, which the Court adopted, was that the complaint contains no factual allegations that identify the bases for his claims. (*See* Doc. 11 at 1.) The May 25, 2022, filing does not call this reasoning into question in any way.

1 To the extent Plaintiff is suggesting that this court should have recused itself due to a
2 conflict of interest, his filing provides no substantive basis for recusal. Plaintiff's assertion that
3 "two or more judicial employees and staff members know and are know associates and close
4 friends of the defendants" is entirely conclusory¹ as is his assertion that "filings were purposely
5 mishandled by them."² For these reasons, the Court will take no further action in connection with
6 the May 25, 2022, filing. This case shall remain closed.

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: August 10, 2022


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

¹ Moreover, the Court has never met any of the defendants named by the defendant in his complaint.

28 ² Because Plaintiff has specifically titled his motion as one regarding "misconduct" by "an employee" he does not appear to be attempting to file a complaint of misconduct against a judicial officer.